Subj: Weisberg update
Date: 94-10-16 22:23:04 EDT.
From: Donz5 Who is he?

Continuing on my merry read of Harold Weisberg's "Case Open." I've come across this gem (it's the first actual example of substance he's made everything previous to this is pure vitriol without a trace of proof):

Re Rosemary Willis, p. 13 (the following 2 paragraphs):

[Posner] has another quote: "'In that first split second, I thought it was a firecracker. But within maybe one-tenth of a second, I knew it was a gunshot ...I think I probably turned to look toward the noise, toward the Book Depository.'"

Who Posner quotes here he does not say. It is not the Willis girl. Ten year olds are not likely to be able to understand what "one tenth of a second" is. Posner, instead of telling his readers who he is quoting, has his footnote "19" here.

(end of Weisberg excerpt)

I guess Weisberg thinks his readers are as sloppy as he is and won't bother to check on what footnote 19 actually is. Surprise, surprise. Weisberg is citing from Posner, p. 321. Footnote 19, on p. 553, reads:

19. Rosemary Willis interview with Marcia Smith-Durk, 1979.

So, let's summarize: Weisberg says it's not Willis who gives that statement, then claims Posner falls back on a footnote rather than say who he's quoting. Of course, it turns out that Willis indeed made that comment in an interview 16 years later, when she's perfectly capable of understanding what "one-tenth of a second is," and Posner indeed sources her quote in.... hey!... footnote 19.

I don't understand how the folks here who hold Weisberg up to some pedestal takes him at all seriously if this is the sort of scholarship he uses.

I think you will FIND THIS EXCHANGE INTERESTING

Subj: New Technology?
Date: 94 10-18 23:58:37 EDT
From: DavidS325

> The author presented some of the new evidence to Governor Connally during a telephone
> conversation in May 1992.

Posner presented some new evidence over the phone?! Interesting fantasy. Why would Connally except Posner's version over, say, the experts on the HSCA?

DonZ expouses all Posner's 'new evidence' without question. Disinformationalist's nonsense. Since JBC has passed over to the other side, It's no wonder Don see's fit to use this bit of garbage to bolster Posner. It can't be refuted. At least not by JBC, who never once, over 30 years, changed his testimony.

BTW, Posner has presented zilch in the way of new evidence.

> p. 7: "One thing only is clear about Failure Analysis: Posner does not say this elaborate and
> costly work was done for him. However, his writing is carefully designed to give the
> impression that it was done for him."

> Posner, p. 503: "Dr. Robert Piziali, of Failure Analysis Associates, and Dr. Michael West have
> done some of the most sophisticated computer-enhancement work on the Zapruder film.

>They not only GAVE ME ACCESS TO THEIR ENHANCEMENTS AND UNDERLYING TESTS [emphasis
> mine] but also patiently guided me through the intricacies of the ballistics issues."

Don, You quoted Weisberg, then Posner, and (naturally) you trusted Posner ...

> "Dr. Robert Piziali, of Failure Analysis Associates"

Piziali doesn't work for FAA. Posner put this disinformation in his book, and so you must therefore post it here as the truth - right? No error too [illegible]

You can achieve some credibility here by doing some personal research (that is, something other than being Posner's unofficial belcher of disinformation) and post here who Piziali actually works for.
Here's a hint: Piziali represented the prosecution side of the 'Mock Trial' by virtue of a simple coin flip. Had he been on the other side, Posner may very well been consulting an actual employee of FAA - Roger McCarthy, who headed the successful defense of Oswald. As Weisberg wrote: "It all failed in the terms in which he misuses it". Posner knew it. He just ignored it. He had no book otherwise.
Posner, according to McCarthy, used FAA's data without it's written approval. They consider his conclusions a joke. As well as a misrepresentation of the work THEY did.
What THEY did was TWO computer studies, one 'proving' Oswald could have done it alone, and one proving conspiracy; then flipped a coin to decide who defends what. For those of you who only know Posner's version ... The entire process was a promotional gimmick to sell FAA's line of software at a

conference of the American Bar association. The result of the "Mock Trial" was a 'hung jury'.
Yet these facts will not be found in Case Closed. One can only wonder what was on Posner's mind as he chose sides. Wasn't the truth.

Part 1

Subj: New Tech? 2
Date: 94-10-19 00:05:57 EDT
From: DavidS325

Part 2

> I don't understand how the folks here who hold Weisberg up to some pedestal takes him at
> all seriously if this is the sort of scholarship he uses.

What is there to not understand?
Weisberg has spent a large portion of his life correcting disinformationalist, like Posner and Jim Moore. They can't ignore him, so they avoid him. Posner spent 3 days coping his files, yet ignored the info that destroyed his 'theories'. Go figure.
Weisberg's complaint is that Posner claims to have read the entire 26 volumes of hearings and exhibits (which he also indexed). Yet throughout CC there is virtually no relevant references to the testimony within it. He instead relies on people like Jim Moore, or worse, his own interviews and his personal opinions based on them. Or even even worse, noncontemporaneous statements made years after the fact. Or even worse worse worse: Phone conversations detailing 'new technology'.

Case in point point point: His rendering of John Connally as suddenly enlightened by his 'new technology'. Of course the new technology he presented to JBC will never be known; it was a phone conversation after all ...

I challenge all those who frequent this forum to read either 'Deep Politics and the Death of JFK' by Peter Dale Scott, or 'The Man Who Knew Too Much' by Dick Russell. Then read Posners' Case Closed (or visa-versa). See for yourselves what lurks out there in the real world of political deception. "Black is white and white is black. It's through the looking glass people".

IMHO, CC seems like a cartoon version of how the events transpired. His graphics explaining the SBT is nothing but a mockery of the truth.

> Don

Dave

"To the rulers of the state then, if to any, it belongs the right to use falsehood, to deceive either enemies or their own citizens, for the [illegible] the state; and no one else may meddle [illegible] this privilege."

The Republic book

3, sect. 389

Subj: David3325
Date: 94-10-19 04:08:24 EDT
From: Donz5

You can call of my posts disinformation all you want. All I ask for is actual refutation of that "disinformation." Thus far the only item you've offered is the identity of Dr. Robert Piziali. If that's the most criminal lapse Posner has committed, it ain't much.

Re Weisberg:

What's curious is that I gave an actual, specific quote out of Weisberg's book, then refuted it with an actual specific quote from Posner. Weisberg was clearly sloppy in his attack on Posner re Rosemary Willis. He accused Posner of making up a quote, when in fact Posner sources that quote as coming directly from Willis. Are you willing to concede this small point?

For the rest of Weisberg's charges (at least up to p. 20 or so; I'm still reading it), that's all he's doing: leveling charges and accusations without a trace of ANYTHING to prove it. That may be entertaining to some, but it offers nothing in the form of a real rebuttal.

Again: I'm giving you chapter and verse; as you disagree, how about refuting it with chapter and verse? All I'm seeing is are silly statements such as "fantasy," "disinformationalist's nonsense," "masking the truth," etc. This is rhetoric, not rebuttal.

Subj: Harold Weisberg
Date: 94-10-06 12:17:45 EDT
From: Bogie1925
(Mitchell Maglio)
Some of you may have heard recent references to Harold weisberg's Case Open. If you are having trouble finding a copy call Carroll and Graf at 260 fifth avenue in New York.
Harold has been writing about the Assassination since 1964. His work has NEVER been seriously challanged. In fact the F.B.I. certified in court that he knows more about the assassination than they do.
He was a principle research source for posner's Case Closed, whom he takes to task so effectively in Case Open.
He has written several books on the assassination, and I will list them here and tell you how to order them.
Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report 27.00
Whitewash II The FBI Secret Service Coverup 7.25
Photographic Whitewash Suppressed Kennedy Assassination Papers 9.25
Whitewash IV Top Secret JFK assassination transcript 7.25
Post Mortem The JFK Assassination Coverup Smashed 12.50
Oswald In New Orleans 27.00
Frame Up The MLK/James Earl Ray case 12.50
I urge anyone sincerely interested in the JFK assassination to contact Harold Weisberg at :
7627 Old Reciever Road
Frederick, Maryland
21702
Bogie

HAROLD,

IT MIGHT INTEREST YOU TO KNOW THAT ELLEN ROTH BOOKS IN MARLBORO NJ GETS QUITE A FEW REQUESTS FOR YOUR WORK! SHE WAS UNAWARE SHE COULD GET COPIES FROM YOU + HAS HAD TO CHARGE $150 + UP FOR THE WHITEWASH SERIES ALONE... WHEN SHE COULD GET IT! SHE ASKED ME FOR A COPY OF YOUR FLYER, WHICH I SENT ALONG. SO SHE WILL BE REFERING REQUESTS YOUR WAY

Mitch